



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,190	03/22/2006	Christina Alpert	PAT-01153	4331
26/922	7590	03/19/2008		
BASF CORPORATION Patent Department 1609 BIDDLE AVENUE MAIN BUILDING WYANDOTTE, MI 48192			EXAMINER NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/19/2008 ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LORLHASS@BASF.COM
MARJORIE.ELLIS@BASF.COM
ANNE.SABOURIN@BASF.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/595,190

Applicant(s)

ALPERT ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick D. Niland

Art Unit

1796

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-23, 27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-23, and 27-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/17/08 has been entered.

The amendment of 1/17/08 has been entered. Claims 1-15, 17-23, and 27-28 are pending.

2. Claims 1-15, 17-23, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. It is unclear what is intended by the language following "selected from the group consisting of" of group a2 of the instant claims due to the grammar of the claims, particularly the numerous uses of "and" in the Markush group or groups of the claims. This numerous uses of "and" makes it unclear exactly what makes up the individual members of the claimed Markush group. See MPEP 2111.03 [R-3].

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference

claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-15, 17-23, and 27-28 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 7019042 Rockrath et al. in view of US Pat. No. 5064871 Sciangola. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of Rockrath encompass the instantly claimed thixotropes including the crystalline morphologies of the instant claims at claim 10 of Rockrath. Rockrath does not disclose catalyzing the urea reaction with the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to catalyze the instantly claimed urea reactions with the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts because Sciangola teaches that the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts are known to catalyze the urea reaction at the abstract, of which "isocyanate reactive compound" includes water and amines per column 2, lines 9-27; column 9, lines 6-12; and the remainder of the document, the catalyzation is expected to give the typical benefits of catalysis such as lowering the activation energy needed to start the reaction and shortening the time of reaction.

The instant claims do not recite sufficient reaction conditions, such as temperature, ingredient types, sequence of ingredient addition, catalyst amounts, etc. to not encompass the urea thixotropic compositions of the claims of Rockrath.

Claim 11 of Rockrath encompasses 0.1 to 10% by weight of the urea crystals. Newly amended claim 1 recites “wherein the rheological aid comprises a bismuth compound and the urea derivative (A) in an amount, based on the rheological aid, of more than 10% by weight.” It is noted that the patentee’s claim weight percent is based solely on the urea crystals whereas the newly recited weight percent is the weight of urea plus catalyst. Thus, at just greater than 10 percent (e.g. infinitesimally greater than 10%), the instant claims contain some catalyst and therefore less than or equal to 10 percent of the urea. Thus, the instant claims and the cited prior art overlap at 10% urea and less, e.g. the amount of urea and catalyst minus the unspecified amount of catalyst in the instant claim 1. Claim 27 requires no amounts. The presence of the bismuth catalyst is inherent in the obviousness statement regarding bismuth catalysts since it would be impossible to remove all of the bismuth from the product.

The applicant’s arguments regarding the purpose of the catalyst in Sciangola are noted. However, Sciangola clearly shows the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts to catalyze the isocyanate/isocyanate reactive group reaction, including the amine/NCO reaction, and this catalysis would have been expected in the reactions of Rockrath. There is no showing of unexpected results commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the cited prior art particularly considering catalyst amounts, specific differences in the various isocyanates and amines used and encompassed, reaction conditions including temperatures, and other material factors which the ordinary skilled artisan understands affect the urea reaction. The applicant’s

arguments of 1/17/08 have been fully considered. However, the claim language of Rockrath encompasses the instantly claimed combinations of amines and the amounts of the instant claims. There is nothing in the enabling disclosure of Rockrath to define the patented claims in any other way. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant claims to use the instantly claimed combinations of amines in the thixotrope of Rockrath's claimed invention because they are encompassed by the patented claims and would have been expected to give the disclosed thixotropy and the instantly claimed amount of thixotrope because it is also encompassed by Rockrath's patented claim language and would have been expected to give thixotropy in proportion to the amount of thixotrope used. There is no showing of unexpected results stemming from the differences between the instant claims and the patented claims of Rockrath in a manner commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the patented claims. For the reasons stated above this rejection is maintained.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-15, 17-23, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 100 42 152 as translated by US Pat. No. 7019042 Rockrath et al. in view of US Pat. No. 5064871 Sciangola.

The instant claims are directed to the product per se, not the method of making the product. See MPEP 2113 in regard to product by process claims. The instant claims are directed to the compositions per se which appear to substantially encompass the compositions of Rockrath (note the entire disclosure including the claims, particularly claim 10), not the methods of making the the compositions. Rockrath does not disclose using the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts in making their ureas. The instantly claimed compositions do not require the bismuth catalysts to remain therein. The instant claims do not recite sufficient reaction conditions, such as temperature, ingredient types, sequence of ingredient addition, catalyst amounts, etc. to not encompass the urea thixotropic compositions of Rockrath. Thus, it appears that the compositions of the instant claims overlap those of the patentee. The fact that the crystalline morphology of the ureas of Rockrath's claims are those of the instant claims supports this conclusion. Note claim 10 of Rockrath.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to catalyze the instantly claimed urea reactions with the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts because Sciangola teaches that the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts are known to catalyze the urea reaction at the abstract, of which "isocyanate reactive compound" includes water and amines per column 2, lines 9-27; column 9, lines 6-12; and the remainder of the document, the catalyzation is expected to give the typical benefits of catalysis such as lowering the activation energy needed to start the reaction and shortening the time of reaction. The instant claims do not recite sufficient reaction

conditions, such as temperature, ingredient types, sequence of ingredient addition, catalyst amounts, etc. to not encompass the urea thixotropic compositions of the claims of Rockrath. No unexpected results commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the cited prior art are seen, particularly considering the broad array of reaction conditions not specified by the instant claims.

Claim 11 of Rockrath encompasses 0.1 to 10% by weight of the urea crystals. Newly amended claim 1 recites “wherein the rheological aid comprises a bismuth compound and the urea derivative (A) in an amount, based on the rheological aid, of more than 10% by weight.” It is noted that the patentee’s claim weight percent is based solely on the urea crystals whereas the newly recited weight percent is the weight of urea plus catalyst. Thus, at just greater than 10 percent (e.g. infinitesimally greater than 10%), the instant claims contain some catalyst and therefore less than or equal to 10 percent of the urea. Thus, the instant claims and the cited prior art overlap at 10% urea and less, e.g. the amount of urea and catalyst minus the unspecified amount of catalyst in the instant claim 1. Claims 27-28 require no amounts. The presence of the bismuth catalyst is inherent in the obviousness statement regarding bismuth catalysts since it would be impossible to remove all of the bismuth from the product.

The applicant’s arguments regarding the purpose of the catalyst in Sciangola are noted. However, Sciangola clearly shows the instantly claimed bismuth catalysts to catalyze the isocyanate/isocyanate reactive group reaction, including the amine/NCO reaction, and this catalysis would have been expected in the reactions of Rockrath. There is no showing of unexpected results commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the cited prior art particularly considering catalyst amounts, specific differences in the various isocyanates and amines used and encompassed, reaction conditions including temperatures, and other material

factors which the ordinary skilled artisan understands affect the urea reaction. The applicant's arguments of 1/17/08 have been fully considered. However, the claim language and disclosure of Rockrath encompasses the instantly claimed combinations of amines and the amounts of the instant claims. There is nothing in the enabling disclosure of Rockrath to define the patented claims in any other way. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant claims to use the instantly claimed combinations of amines in the thixotrope of Rockrath's disclosed invention because they are encompassed by the patentee's disclosure and would have been expected to give the disclosed thixotropy and the instantly claimed amount of thixotrope because it is also encompassed by Rockrath's disclosure and would have been expected to give thixotropy in proportion to the amount of thixotrope used. There is no showing of unexpected results stemming from the differences between the instant claims and the patentee's disclosed inventions in a manner commensurate in scope with the instant claims and the prior art cited. For the reasons stated above this rejection is maintained.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick D. Niland whose telephone number is 571-272-1121. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 10 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached on 571-272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 1796

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patrick D Niland/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796